

Remarks/Arguments

Reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the present amendment is respectfully requested.

By the present amendment, claims 1 and 10 have been amended to include the limitations of claim 5 that recite the first repeating unit and the second repeating unit are in the same polymer chain. Claim 5 was identified on page 7 of the Office Action as defining over the prior art but was objected to as being dependent from a rejected base claim. Claim 5 and withdrawn claim 10, which recites similar limitations as claim 5, have been cancelled.

Below is a discussion of the 35 USC 103(a) rejection of claims 1-2 and 7 and the restriction requirement in view of the amended claims.

Claims 1-2 and 7 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over WO 00/14305 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,652,728 and U.S. Patent No. 4,506,081. As discussed above, claim 1 was amended to include the limitations of claim 5, which was identified as being allowable. Accordingly, withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of claim 1 is respectfully requested. Claims 2 and 7 depend from claim 1 and are therefore allowable because of the limitations recited in claim 1.

Claim 10-18 were previously restricted as not being drawn to a single general inventive concept. In view of Applicants' current amendment and the elected species, Applicants request that the restriction of at least claims 10, 11, and 17 be withdrawn. Claim 10 includes the same limitations of claim 1 except that the first repeating unit is specific to the first repeating unit of the elected species, which is identified in claim 2. As the elected species has been found to be allowable in view

of art identified in the Office Action and this elected species is more specifically embodied by amended claim 10 and dependant claims 11 and 17, Applicants respectfully request the restriction requirement to claims 10, 11, and 17 be withdrawn as these claims are directed to the same general inventive concept as claims 1, 2, and 7. Moreover, since the Examiner has determined that the elected species is allowable, Applicants request examination of claims 1 and 10 be extended to the nonelected species of claims 1 and 10. Should the prior art be found to not teach the non-elected species of claims 1 and 10, Applicants request the restriction requirement to the non-elected species be withdrawn and the withdrawn claims allowed.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition of allowance and allowance of the present application is respectfully requested.

Please charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment in the fees for this matter to our Deposit Account No. 20-0090.

Respectfully submitted,

/Richard A. Sutkus/
Richard A. Sutkus
Reg. No. 43,941

TAROLLI, SUNDHEIM, COVELL,
& TUMMINO L.L.P.
1300 East Ninth Street, Suite 1700
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Phone: (216) 621-2234
Fax: (216) 621-4072
Customer No.: 26,294